

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 1, 1998

LB 1142

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senator Wickersham, by the way, has been very gracious and very much a diplomat in the way that he has attended to his obligation as the chairman of the committee. This is a bill that Senator Wickersham does not support and I think he's shown an even-handedness which I am grateful for. And, by the way, the Revenue Committee reported this bill out five to three so let me suggest that we adopt the committee amendments as that is the form of the bill that the committee wishes you at least to consider, at least the majority who reported it out. And then secondly, I see my colleague, Senator Bromm, here has a beige piece of paper turned over but it looks like a motion pad and I'm going to guess it's a kill motion. I could be wrong, but we'll get to that issue ASAP if that's what you want. I would like to, however, have the committee amendments adopted first if possible. Now I want to talk just a little bit about this again, okay? And, of course, it's not Sam's fault we just call him Sam Slider, yeah, thanks, Curt. But Senator Bromm says, wait a second. Isn't there a constitutional difficulty under my example? Take a look at year four under the Senator Bromm broadside here onto 1142. What's the taxes that both people pay in that year or that they are assessed? A thousand dollars, exactly the same. Now one of the two people gets a rebate, but that happens, I mean, we use the difference in taxation in the homestead situation, between the disabled...

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...between the veterans which means the tax against the house is the same. That is not unconstitutional. As a matter of fact, what is unconstitutional here on this page because it's sure not year four. I'll tell you what it is. It's this stuff right up here about Tom's house and Sam's house. One's at 50,000 bucks of assessed and market, the others are at 35,000 and 50,000 bucks. The only unconstitutional thing here is the very situation that gives rise to this piece of paper and that's what's wrong. It's the assessor's practice which is unconstitutional. If there's anything on this page that's unconstitutional, it's exactly the situation that Senator Bromm says, ah, well, that's just a fact of life. No, we want to "incent" a change of behavior which is what this bill does. At